

COMMUNICATIONS.

THE A. M. A. FINANCIAL STATEMENT AGAIN.

To the Editor of the STATE JOURNAL: I was very much surprised by the editorial in the August number of the JOURNAL commenting upon the report of the Trustees of the A. M. A. At first I thought you certainly had made a grave error, for it seemed quite impossible that the *Journal of the A. M. A.*, carrying as it does such a large amount of advertising, and having such a tremendous circulation, could possibly be running behind. I have made a very careful study of the report, and while I may say that I think I can see the mistake in your reasoning, the whole report is a most curious document, and becomes more perplexing as one devotes more time to its study. Your error lies in the fact that you seem to take it for granted that all the members would pay their \$5.00 dues if they did not get the *Journal*. The Trustees, on the other hand, seem to regard the amount for dues merely as so much money paid for the *Journal*, and in fact give the impression that the great American Medical Association is merely a sort of small adjunct to the *Journal*—existing only for the purpose of getting subscribers to that most excellent publication. But even granting that such is the case, how does it happen that the amount received from dues is \$63,237.48? The dues are \$5.00, which would indicate a membership (paid) of 12,647.496; who is the unfortunate person who is only .496 of a member? On page 1638 is the following table:

Association net profit.....	\$40,488.68
Association expense	\$6,629.80
Organization expense	5,323.19
	<hr/>
	11,952.99
	<hr/>
	\$52,441.67
Less interest on bonds....	\$560.00
Net income on houses.....	1,400.34
	<hr/>
	1,960.34
	<hr/>
Journal profit, 1903.....	\$50,481.33

They start with some \$40,000 Association profit, yet close their statement with over \$50,000 Journal profit, four-fifths of which is already given, not as a Journal profit, but as an earning of the Association. But in any event, and aside from whether you are right in your contention or not, it appears that we members of the Association are paying about \$3.50 a year more dues than we should; for certainly that much of our \$5.00 seems to be going into a "sinking fund," for what purpose no one whom I have asked seems to know. Can you tell me what good this money is doing or is going to do? Or can you give me any reason why we should not demand that our dues be reduced, or retire from affiliation with the Association? If you insist, you may publish my name, but I would rather you did not. Very respectfully,

X. Y. Z.

PLEASE HELP!

To the Editor of the STATE JOURNAL: Can you tell me why the following names are not to be found in the Register and Directory published by the society? I noticed them in a recent number of the *Southern California Practitioner*, and looked for them in the Register. I could not find them, and so turned back to the last edition of the old Register, published in 1902, but could not find them in that, either: Dr. J. I. Clark, Santa Ana; Dr. C. H. Rowell, from San Francisco to Fullerton; Dr. J. F. Spencer, from Los Angeles to Gardena; Dr. John Y. Oldham, from Kentucky to Los Angeles; Dr. E. E. Selleck, from New Mexico to Los Angeles. I am not particularly interested in these men, but if they are licensed to practice in California,

why are not their names in the official Register? Respectfully,

A MEMBER.

[I have looked up the names as given by "A Member," but cannot find them. Why they are not to be found in either of the last two editions of the Register, I cannot say. It may be for any one of a number of reasons. Possibly they have no license to practice; perhaps they took out a license years ago, and have just come to the state. The real reason is, however, that co-operation on the part of physicians themselves is not what it should be. If every doctor in the state would take the time and the trouble to let us know as soon as a new doctor appeared in his section, it would be but a very short time till we had all this confusion entirely cleared up, and could say at once just "who's who." There is absolutely no way of getting this matter definitely straightened out unless each and every member of the society will help us with the work.—Ed.]

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS.

To the Editor of the STATE JOURNAL: The flight of time admonishes us that we are surely and swiftly nearing the date of the Fifteenth International Congress of Medicine, to be held in the latter part of April, 1906, at Lisbon, Portugal. In view of that fact the enclosed circular, which was sent by the learned, efficient and amiable Secretary-General of the Congress, Professor Miguel Bombarda, to many members of the profession in various parts of the world, is particularly opportune. The information contained therein seems to be of sufficient moment to entitle it to space (as there requested) in the next number of your valued JOURNAL, in the interest of the profession on this coast, many of whom, it is hoped, may find time and leisure to attend the congress and to visit the land of Pombal, Camoens and Albuquerque. Hoping that you may see your way clear to comply with the request made, I remain, my dear colleague, yours fraternally,

ALFRED E. REGENSBURGER.

INERT DRUGS.

To the Editor of the STATE JOURNAL: I do not see why C. S. H. (communication Vol. II, No. 6) should have singled out digitalis in fluid extract as unreliable, allowing the readers of his letter to infer that other galenicals were less uncertain in strength and action. Do any up-to-date physicians use extract or tincture of cinchona when they wish to exhibit the antiperiodic effect associated with the action of its active principle, or do they use tincture of opium when the effect of morphin upon peristaltic action is desired? Probably not; but many do prescribe fluid extracts or tinctures of veratrum, digitalis and pilocarpin. The virtue of any tincture, fluid extract or other preparation, depends upon the amount of the active principle of the substance from which it is prepared, and as no two lots of leaves, bark, roots, buds or twigs contain the same proportion, nor any two manufacturers produce fluid extracts or tinctures which are absolutely alike in active principle strength, it should occasion little surprise if we were all therapeutic nihilists. That there are reliable preparations of the active principles of such plants as are used in medicine seems known to most physicians, but the inertia of conservatism renders the extension of the list very slow. Aconitin, atropin, emetin, apocynin, arbutin, atropin, berberin, brucin, cactin, caffen, cicutin, cocain, codein, colchicin, digitalin, emetin, ergotin, gelsemin, heroin, hydrastin, hyoscyamin, hyoscin, iridin, morphin, picrotapin, pilocarpin, podophyllin, quassin, quinin, santonin, strychnin, veratrin, represent many of the active principles of the drugs we use, and have the advantages of reliability, permanence and certainty of action; with greater accuracy of dosage; when liquid